

Atty. Dkt. No. 025782-0114 (3669.Palm)  
(f/k/a 035451-0140)

### REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 1, 35, 38-40, 67, 86, 89, and 96 are currently being amended.

This amendment changes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate status identifier for each claim.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1, 3-23, 25-36, 38-46, 48-54, 56-71, and 73-96 are pending in this application.

### Claim Objections

In section 1 of the Office Action, claims 38-40 are objected to as being of improper dependent form. Claims 38-40 are amended to depend from claim 35. Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of the objection to claims 38-40.

### Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

- a. Rejection of claims 1, 3, 7-19, 23, 25, 29-30, 32-33, 35, 38, 41-44, 46, 48, 51, 53, 56-59, 67-69, 71, 78-80, 86, 88-89, and 93-94 based on Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al.

In section 4 of the Office Action, claims 1, 3, 7-19, 23, 25, 29-30, 32-33, 35, 38, 41-44, 46, 48, 51, 53, 56-59, 67-69, 71, 78-80, 86, 88-89, and 93-94 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Janakiraman et al. (U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2002/0124020) in view of Nelson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,498,897). Each specific rejection is addressed below.

#### I. Claims 1, 3, and 7-19

With regard to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson fails to disclose all of the steps of claim 1 as combined

Atty. Dkt. No. 025782-0114 (3669.Palm)  
(f/k/a 035451-0140)

therein. Specifically, claim 1 (as amended) recites "sending a list of supported formats from the electronic device to a proxy server." The cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson does not teach, disclose, or suggest "sending a list of supported formats from the electronic device to a proxy server" as included in the combination of steps of claim 1.

The Office Action correctly acknowledges that Janakiraman et al. "is silent on sending a list of supported formats to a proxy server." However, the Office Action further states that Nelson et al. discloses "sending a list of supported formats [col. 4, lns. 23-36 i.e. MPEG-1, MPEG-2, MPEG-4, H.263, RealVideo, and other packetized forms of digital media] to a proxy server [item 44 of fig. 5][figs. 2-4]." Nelson et al., however, discloses only that the header information cited in the Office Action (i.e., "col. 4, lns. 23-36 i.e. MPEG-1, MPEG-2, MPEG-4, H.263, RealVideo, and other packetized forms of digital media") is provided to the proxy server from the media file system. See col. 5, lines 19-37. Thus, the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. does not teach, disclose, or suggest "sending a list of supported formats from the electronic device to a proxy server," and particularly not as part of a "method of transferring electronic data from a remote location to an electronic device over a bandwidth-constrained connection" when combined with the other steps of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn. Additionally, claims 3 and 7-19 depend from claim 1 and are thus patentable over the cited combination of references for at least the same reasons as claim 1, and Applicants further request that the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn as well.

ii. **Claims 23, 25, 29-30, and 32-33**

With regard to claim 23, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson fails to disclose all of the steps of claim 23 as combined therein. Specifically, claim 23 recites "sending a list of supported formats from the electronic device to the filtering system." The cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson does not teach, disclose, or suggest "sending a list of supported formats from the electronic device to the filtering system" as included in the combination of steps of claim 23.

Atty. Dkt. No. 025782-0114 (3669.Palm)  
(f/k/a 035451-0140)

The Office Action correctly acknowledges that Janakiraman et al. "is silent on sending a list of supported formats to a proxy server." However, the Office Action further states that Nelson et al. discloses "sending a list of supported formats [col. 4, lns. 23-36 i.e. MPEG-1, MPEG-2, MPEG-4, H.263, RealVideo, and other packetized forms of digital media] to a proxy server [item 44 of fig. 5][figs. 2-4]." Nelson et al., however, discloses only that the header information cited in the Office Action (i.e., "col. 4, lns. 23-36 i.e. MPEG-1, MPEG-2, MPEG-4, H.263, RealVideo, and other packetized forms of digital media") is provided to the proxy server from the media file system. See col. 5, lines 19-37. Thus, the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. does not teach, disclose, or suggest "sending a list of supported formats from the electronic device to the filtering system," and particularly not as part of a "method of transmitting electronic information to an electronic device" when combined with the other steps of claim 23. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn. Additionally, claims 25, 29-30, and 32-33 depend from claim 23 and are thus patentable over the cited combination of references for at least the same reasons as claim 23, and Applicants further request that the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn as well.

### iii Claims 35, 38 and 41-44

With regard to claim 35, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson fails to disclose all of the steps of claim 35 as combined therein. Specifically, claim 35 (as amended) recites "sending a list of supported formats from the electronic device to the data transmission system." The cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson does not teach, disclose, or suggest "sending a list of supported formats from the electronic device to the data transmission system" as included in the combination of steps of claim 35.

The Office Action correctly acknowledges that Janakiraman et al. "is silent on sending a list of supported formats to a proxy server." However, the Office Action further states that Nelson et al. discloses "sending a list of supported formats [col. 4, lns. 23-36 i.e. MPEG-1, MPEG-2, MPEG-4, H.263, RealVideo, and other packetized forms of digital media] to a proxy

Atty. Dkt. No. 025782-0114 (3669.Palm)  
(f/k/a 035451-0140)

server [item 44 of fig. 5][figs. 2-4].” Nelson et al., however, discloses only that the header information cited in the Office Action (i.e., “col. 4, lns. 23-36 i.e. MPEG-1, MPEG-2, MPEG-4, H.263, RealVideo, and other packetized forms of digital media”) is provided to the proxy server from the media file system. See col. 5, lines 19-37. Thus, the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. does not teach, disclose, or suggest “sending a list of supported formats from the electronic device to the data transmission system,” and particularly not as part of a “method of collecting electronic data from a remote source” when combined with the other steps of claim 35. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claim 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn. Additionally, claims 38 and 41-44 depend from claim 35 and are thus patentable over the cited combination of references for at least the same reasons as claim 35, and Applicants further request that the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn as well.

iv Claims 46, 48 and 51

With regard to claim 46, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson fails to disclose all of the steps of claim 46 as combined therein. Specifically, claim 46 recites “wherein the list of supported data formats is generated within the electronic device and sent to the data transmission system.” The cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson does not teach, disclose, or suggest “wherein the list of supported data formats is generated within the electronic device and sent to the data transmission system” as included in the combination of steps of claim 46.

The Office Action correctly acknowledges that Janakiraman et al. “is silent on sending a list of supported formats to a proxy server.” However, the Office Action further states that Nelson et al. discloses “sending a list of supported formats [col. 4, lns. 23-36 i.e. MPEG-1, MPEG-2, MPEG-4, H.263, RealVideo, and other packetized forms of digital media] to a proxy server [item 44 of fig. 5][figs. 2-4].” Nelson et al., however, discloses only that the header information cited in the Office Action (i.e., “col. 4, lns. 23-36 i.e. MPEG-1, MPEG-2, MPEG-4, H.263, RealVideo, and other packetized forms of digital media”) is provided to the proxy server from the media file system. See col. 5, lines 19-37. Thus, the cited combination of Janakiraman

Atty. Dkt. No. 025782-0114 (3669.Palm)  
(f/k/a 035451-0140)

et al. in view of Nelson et al. does not teach, disclose, or suggest “wherein the list of supported data formats is generated within the electronic device and sent to the data transmission system,” and particularly not as part of a “method of filtering electronic data from a remote source location based on the compatibility of the information with applications included in a wireless electronic device” when combined with the other steps of claim 46. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claim 46 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn. Additionally, claims 48 and 51 depend from claim 46 and are thus patentable over the cited combination of references for at least the same reasons as claim 46, and Applicants further request that the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn as well.

v. **Claims 53 and 56-59**

With regard to claim 53, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson fails to disclose all of the steps of claim 53 as combined therein. Specifically, claim 53 recites “wherein the list of supported data formats is received simultaneously with the request from the portable electronic device.” The cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson does not teach, disclose, or suggest “wherein the list of supported data formats is received simultaneously with the request from the portable electronic device” as included in the combination of steps of claim 53.

The Office Action correctly acknowledges that Janakiraman et al. “is silent on sending a list of supported formats to a proxy server.” However, the Office Action further states that Nelson et al. discloses “sending a list of supported formats [col. 4, lns. 23-36 i.e. MPEG-1, MPEG-2, MPEG-4, H.263, RealVideo, and other packetized forms of digital media] to a proxy server [item 44 of fig. 5][figs. 2-4].” Nelson et al. however, discloses only that the header information cited in the Office Action (i.e., “col. 4, lns. 23-36 i.e. MPEG-1, MPEG-2, MPEG-4, H.263, RealVideo, and other packetized forms of digital media”) is provided to the proxy server from the media file system. See col. 5, lines 19-37. Thus, the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. does not teach, disclose, or suggest “wherein the list of supported data formats is received simultaneously with the request from the portable electronic device,” and particularly not as part of a “method of delivering electronic data in a wireless environment”

Atty. Dkt. No. 025782-0114 (3669.Palm)  
(f/k/a 035451-0140)

when combined with the other steps of claim 53. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claim 53 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn. Additionally, claims 56-59 depend from claim 53 and are thus patentable over the cited combination of references for at least the same reasons as claim 53, and Applicants further request that the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn as well.

vi. Claims 67-69, 71, and 78-80

With regard to claim 67, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson fails to disclose all of the elements of claim 67 as combined therein. Specifically, claim 67 (as amended) recites “wherein the means for filtering the electronic data comprises means for comparing the format of the electronic data to a list of data formats supported by applications included in the electronic device, the list of data formats being received from the electronic device.” The cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson does not teach, disclose, or suggest “wherein the means for filtering the electronic data comprises means for comparing the format of the electronic data to a list of data formats supported by applications included in the electronic device, the list of data formats being received from the electronic device” as included in the combination of elements of claim 67.

The Office Action correctly acknowledges that Janakiraman et al. “is silent on sending a list of supported formats to a proxy server.” However, the Office Action further states that Nelson et al. discloses “sending a list of supported formats [col. 4, lns. 23-36 i.e. MPEG-1, MPEG-2, MPEG-4, H.263, RealVideo, and other packetized forms of digital media] to a proxy server [item 44 of fig. 5][figs. 2-4].” Nelson et al., however, discloses only that the header information cited in the Office Action (i.e., “col. 4, lns. 23-36 i.e. MPEG-1, MPEG-2, MPEG-4, H.263, RealVideo, and other packetized forms of digital media”) is provided to the proxy server from the media file system. See col. 5, lines 19-37. Thus, the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. does not teach, disclose, or suggest “wherein the means for filtering the electronic data comprises means for comparing the format of the electronic data to a list of data formats supported by applications included in the electronic device, the list of data formats being received from the electronic device,” and particularly not as part of a “system for

Atty. Dkt. No. 025782-0114 (3669.Palm)  
(f/k/a 035451-0140)

transmitting compatible electronic data to an electronic device over a bandwidth-constrained connection” when combined with the other elements of claim 67. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claim 67 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn. Additionally, claims 68-69, 71, and 78-80 depend from claim 67 and are thus patentable over the cited combination of references for at least the same reasons as claim 67, and Applicants further request that the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn as well.

**vii. Claims 86, 88-89, and 93-94**

With regard to claim 86, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson fails to disclose all of the elements of claim 86 as combined therein. Specifically, claim 86 (as amended) recites “means for filtering the requested electronic data to exclude incompatible data based on a list of data formats supported by applications included in the portable electronic device, the list of supported data formats being received from the portable electronic device.” The cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson does not teach, disclose, or suggest “means for filtering the requested electronic data to exclude incompatible data based on a list of data formats supported by applications included in the portable electronic device, the list of supported data formats being received from the portable electronic device” as included in the combination of elements of claim 86.

The Office Action correctly acknowledges that Janakiraman et al. “is silent on sending a list of supported formats to a proxy server.” However, the Office Action further states that Nelson et al. discloses “sending a list of supported formats [col. 4, lns. 23-36 i.e. MPEG-1, MPEG-2, MPEG-4, H.263, RealVideo, and other packetized forms of digital media] to a proxy server [item 44 of fig. 5][figs. 2-4].” Nelson et al., however, discloses only that the header information cited in the Office Action (i.e., “col. 4, lns. 23-36 i.e. MPEG-1, MPEG-2, MPEG-4, H.263, RealVideo, and other packetized forms of digital media”) is provided to the proxy server from the media file system. See col. 5, lines 19-37. Thus, the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. does not teach, disclose, or suggest “means for filtering the requested electronic data to exclude incompatible data based on a list of data formats supported by applications included in the portable electronic device, the list of supported data formats being

Atty. Dkt. No. 025782-0114 (3669.Palm)  
(f/k/a 035451-0140)

received from the portable electronic device," and particularly not as part of a "system for wirelessly transmitting electronic data from a remote source to a portable electronic device" when combined with the other elements of claim 86. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claim 86 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn. Additionally, claims 88-89 and 93-94 depend from claim 86 and are thus patentable over the cited combination of references for at least the same reasons as claim 86, and Applicants further request that the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn as well.

**b. Rejection of claims 4-6, 19, 26-27, 39-40, 49-50, 73-75, and 90-92 based on Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. and further in view of Adachi.**

In section 21 of the Office Action, claims 4-6, 19, 26-27, 39-40, 49-50, 73-75, and 90-92 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. and further in view of Adachi (U.S. Patent No. 6,877,037). Each specific rejection is addressed below.

**i. Claims 4-6 and 19**

Claims 4-6 and 19 depend from claim 1. As explained above, the combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. does not teach, disclose, or suggest the subject matter of claim 1. As to Adachi, it fails to disclose any of the steps of claim 1 mentioned above that are lacking in the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. Because the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. and further in view of Adachi fails to disclose all of the steps of claim 1 as combined therein, and because claims 4-6 and 19 depend from claim 1, claims 4-6 and 19 are patentable over the cited combination of references for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claims 4-6 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

**ii. Claims 26-27**

Claims 26-27 depend from claim 23. As explained above, the combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. does not teach, disclose, or suggest the subject matter of claim 23. As to Adachi, it fails to disclose any of the steps of claim 23 mentioned above that



Atty. Dkt. No. 025782-0114 (3669.Palm)  
(f/k/a 035451-0140)

are lacking in the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. Because the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. and further in view of Adachi fails to disclose all of the steps of claim 23 as combined therein, and because claims 26-27 depend from claim 23, claims 26-27 are patentable over the cited combination of references for at least the same reasons as claim 23. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claims 26-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

**iii. Claims 39-40**

Claims 39-40 depend from claim 35. As explained above, the combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. does not teach, disclose, or suggest the subject matter of claim 35. As to Adachi, it fails to disclose any of the steps of claim 35 mentioned above that are lacking in the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. Because the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. and further in view of Adachi fails to disclose all of the steps of claim 35 as combined therein, and because claims 39-40 depend from claim 35, claims 39-40 are patentable over the cited combination of references for at least the same reasons as claim 35. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claims 39-40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

**iv. Claims 49-50**

Claims 49-50 depend from claim 46. As explained above, the combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. does not teach, disclose, or suggest the subject matter of claim 46. As to Adachi, it fails to disclose any of the steps of claim 46 mentioned above that are lacking in the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. Because the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. and further in view of Adachi fails to disclose all of the steps of claim 46 as combined therein, and because claims 49-50 depend from claim 46, claims 49-50 are patentable over the cited combination of references for at least the same reasons as claim 46. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claims 49-50 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Atty. Dkt. No. 025782-0114 (3669.Palm)  
(f/k/a 035451-0140)

**v. Claims 73-75**

Claims 73-75 depend from claim 67. As explained above, the combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. does not teach, disclose, or suggest the subject matter of claim 67. As to Adachi, it fails to disclose any of the elements of claim 67 mentioned above that are lacking in the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. Because the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. and further in view of Adachi fails to disclose all of the elements of claim 67 as combined therein, and because claims 73-75 depend from claim 67, claims 73-75 are patentable over the cited combination of references for at least the same reasons as claim 67. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claims 73-75 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

**vi. Claims 90-92**

Claims 90-92 depend from claim 86. As explained above, the combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. does not teach, disclose, or suggest the subject matter of claim 86. As to Adachi, it fails to disclose any of the elements of claim 86 mentioned above that are lacking in the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. Because the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. and further in view of Adachi fails to disclose all of the elements of claim 86 as combined therein, and because claims 90-92 depend from claim 86, claims 90-92 are patentable over the cited combination of references for at least the same reasons as claim 86. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claims 90-92 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

**c. Rejection of claims 95-96 based on Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. and further in view of Adachi<sup>1</sup>, and further in view of Schwartz et al.**

In section 25 of the Office Action, claims 95-96 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. and further in view of Adachi and further in view of Schwartz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,473,609). Claims 95-96 depend from

---

<sup>1</sup> Applicants assume that the Office Action was intended to recite Adachi with regard to claim 92 and to claims 95-96 instead of Timothy. Applicants reserve the right to present revised arguments as necessary in the event that this assumption is incorrect.

Atty. Dkt. No. 025782-0114 (3669.Palm)  
(f/k/a 035451-0140)

claim 92. As explained above, the combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. and further in view of Adachi does not teach, disclose, or suggest the subject matter of claim 86. As to Schwartz et al., it fails to disclose any of the elements of claim 92 mentioned above that are lacking in the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. and further in view of Adachi. Because the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. and further in view of Adachi and further in view of Schwartz et al. fails to disclose all of the elements of claim 92 as combined therein, and because claims 95-96 depend from claim 92, claims 95-96 are patentable over the cited combination of references for at least the same reasons as claim 92. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claims 95-96 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

**d. Rejection of claims 20-22, 34, 45, 52, 60, and 76-77 based on Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. and further in view of Schwartz et al.**

In section 28 of the Office Action, claims 20-22, 34, 45, 52, 60, and 76-77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. and further in view of Schwartz et al. Each specific rejection is addressed below.

**i. Claims 20-22**

Claims 20-22 depend from claim 1. As explained above, the combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. does not teach, disclose, or suggest the subject matter of claim 1. As to Schwartz et al., it fails to disclose any of the steps of claim 1 mentioned above that are lacking in the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. Because the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. and further in view of Schwartz et al. fails to disclose all of the steps of claim 1 as combined therein, and because claims 20-22 depend from claim 1, claims 20-22 are patentable over the cited combination of references for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claims 20-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Atty. Dkt. No. 025782-0114 (3669.Palm)  
(f/k/a 035451-0140)

**ii. Claim 34**

Claim 34 depends from claim 23. As explained above, the combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. does not teach, disclose, or suggest the subject matter of claim 23. As to Schwartz et al., it fails to disclose any of the steps of claim 23 mentioned above that are lacking in the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. Because the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. and further in view of Schwartz et al. fails to disclose all of the steps of claim 23 as combined therein, and because claim 34 depends from claim 23, claim 34 is patentable over the cited combination of references for at least the same reasons as claim 23. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claim 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

**iii. Claim 45**

Claim 45 depends from claim 35. As explained above, the combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. does not teach, disclose, or suggest the subject matter of claim 35. As to Schwartz et al., it fails to disclose any of the steps of claim 35 mentioned above that are lacking in the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. Because the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. and further in view of Schwartz et al. fails to disclose all of the steps of claim 35 as combined therein, and because claim 45 depends from claim 35, claim 45 is patentable over the cited combination of references for at least the same reasons as claim 35. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claim 45 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

**iv. Claim 52**

Claim 52 depends from claim 46. As explained above, the combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. does not teach, disclose, or suggest the subject matter of claim 46. As to Schwartz et al., it fails to disclose any of the steps of claim 46 mentioned above that are lacking in the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. Because the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. and further in view of Schwartz et al. fails to disclose all of the steps of claim 46 as combined therein, and because claim 52 depends

Atty. Dkt. No. 025782-0114 (3669.Palm)  
(f/k/a 035451-0140)

from claim 46, claim 52 is patentable over the cited combination of references for at least the same reasons as claim 46. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claim 52 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

v. **Claim 60**

Claim 60 depends from claim 53. As explained above, the combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. does not teach, disclose, or suggest the subject matter of claim 53. As to Schwartz et al., it fails to disclose any of the steps of claim 53 mentioned above that are lacking in the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. Because the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. and further in view of Schwartz et al. fails to disclose all of the steps of claim 53 as combined therein, and because claim 60 depends from claim 53, claim 60 is patentable over the cited combination of references for at least the same reasons as claim 53. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claim 60 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

vi. **Claims 76-77**

Claims 76-77 depend from claim 67. As explained above, the combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. does not teach, disclose, or suggest the subject matter of claim 67. As to Schwartz et al., it fails to disclose any of the elements of claim 67 mentioned above that are lacking in the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. Because the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. and further in view of Schwartz et al. fails to disclose all of the elements of claim 67 as combined therein, and because claims 76-77 depend from claim 67, claims 76-77 are patentable over the cited combination of references for at least the same reasons as claim 67. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claims 76-77 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Att. Dkt. No. 025782-0114 (3669.Palm)  
(f/k/a 035451-0140)

**e. Rejection of claims 28, 31, 36, 54, 70, and 87 based on Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. and further in view of Timothy.**

In section 32 of the Office Action, claims 28, 31, 36, 54, 70, and 87 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. and further in view of Timothy. Each specific rejection is addressed below.

**i. Claims 28 and 31**

Claims 28 and 31 depend from claim 23. As explained above, the combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. does not teach, disclose, or suggest the subject matter of claim 23. As to Timothy, it fails to disclose any of the steps of claim 23 mentioned above that are lacking in the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. Because the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. and further in view of Timothy fails to disclose all of the steps of claim 23 as combined therein, and because claims 28 and 31 depend from claim 23, claims 28 and 31 are patentable over the cited combination of references for at least the same reasons as claim 23. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claims 28 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

**ii. Claim 36**

Claim 36 depends from claim 35. As explained above, the combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. does not teach, disclose, or suggest the subject matter of claim 35. As to Timothy, it fails to disclose any of the steps of claim 35 mentioned above that are lacking in the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. Because the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. and further in view of Timothy fails to disclose all of the steps of claim 35 as combined therein, and because claim 36 depends from claim 35, claim 36 is patentable over the cited combination of references for at least the same reasons as claim 35. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claim 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Att. Dkt. No. 025782-0114 (3669.Palm)  
(f/k/a 035451-0140)

iii. **Claim 54**

Claim 54 depends from claim 53. As explained above, the combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. does not teach, disclose, or suggest the subject matter of claim 53. As to Timothy, it fails to disclose any of the steps of claim 53 mentioned above that are lacking in the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. Because the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. and further in view of Timothy fails to disclose all of the steps of claim 53 as combined therein, and because claim 54 depends from claim 53, claim 54 is patentable over the cited combination of references for at least the same reasons as claim 53. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claim 54 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

iv. **Claim 70**

Claim 70 depends from claim 67. As explained above, the combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. does not teach, disclose, or suggest the subject matter of claim 67. As to Timothy, it fails to disclose any of the elements of claim 67 mentioned above that are lacking in the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. Because the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. and further in view of Timothy fails to disclose all of the elements of claim 67 as combined therein, and because claim 70 depends from claim 67, claim 70 is patentable over the cited combination of references for at least the same reasons as claim 67. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claim 70 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

v. **Claim 87**

Claim 87 depends from claim 86. As explained above, the combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. does not teach, disclose, or suggest the subject matter of claim 86. As to Timothy, it fails to disclose any of the elements of claim 86 mentioned above that are lacking in the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. Because the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Nelson et al. and further in view of Timothy fails to disclose all of the elements of claim 86 as combined therein, and because claim 87 depends from

Att. Dkt. No. 025782-0114 (3669.Palm)  
(f/k/a 035451-0140)

claim 86, claim 87 is patentable over the cited combination of references for at least the same reasons as claim 86. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claim 87 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

**f. Rejection of claims 61-62, 64-65, and 81-82 based on Janakiraman et al. in view of Timothy.**

In section 35 of the Office Action, claims 61-62, 64-65, and 81-82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Janakiraman et al. in view of Timothy. Each specific rejection is addressed below.

**i. Claims 61-62 and 64-65**

With regard to claim 61, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Timothy fails to disclose all of the steps of claim 61 as combined therein. Specifically, claim 61 recites "transmitting a list of plug-ins loaded on the portable electronic device to the proxy server." The cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Timothy does not teach, disclose, or suggest "transmitting a list of plug-ins loaded on the portable electronic device to the proxy server" as included in the combination of steps of claim 61.

The Office Action correctly acknowledges that Janakiraman et al. "is silent on the proxy server." However, the Office Action further states that Janakiraman et al. teaches "transmitting a list of plug-ins loaded on the portable electronic device to the server." Janakiraman et al., however, discloses only the forwarding of "an HTML file specifying one or more multimedia files to client 120 so that web browser 122 of client 120 may output textual equivalents of the multimedia content in the one or more multimedia files." Janakiraman et al. makes no mention at all of "transmitting a list of plug-ins loaded on the portable electronic device" to any device. In Janakiraman et al., the received multimedia files are simply searched within the client for possible textual equivalents contained within certain file types regardless of any transmitted list of plug-ins. Thus, Janakiraman et al. fails to teach, disclose, or suggest "transmitting a list of



Atty. Dkt. No. 025782-0114 (3669.Palm)  
(f/k/a 035451-0140)

plug-ins loaded on the portable electronic device to the proxy server” as included in the combination of steps of claim 61.

As to Timothy, the Office Action states that it “discloses the proxy server [see page 535 Section 2.4 ‘Automatic re-authoring’ and Section 2.5 ‘Page filtering’].” Timothy, however, only generally discloses performing web page filtering on a proxy server, and makes no specific mention of transmitting a list of “transmitting a list of plug-ins loaded on the portable electronic device to the proxy server.” Thus, the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Timothy does not teach, disclose, or suggest “transmitting a list of plug-ins loaded on the portable electronic device to the proxy server” and particularly not as part of a “method of receiving information embedded in an Internet web page” as recited in the combination of steps of claim 61. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claim 61 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn. Additionally, claims 62, and 64-65 depend from claim 61 and are thus patentable over the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Timothy for at least the same reasons as claim 61, and Applicants further request that the rejection of claims 62, and 64-65 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn as well.

**ii. Claims 81-82**

With regard to claim 81, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Timothy fails to disclose all of the elements of claim 81 as combined therein. Specifically, claim 81 recites “means for generating a list of file types supported by applications included in the electronic device.” The cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Timothy does not teach, disclose, or suggest “means for generating a list of file types supported by applications included in the electronic device” as included in the combination of elements of claim 81.

The Office Action correctly acknowledges that Janakiraman et al. “is silent on the proxy server.” However, the Office Action further states that Janakiraman et al. teaches “transmitting a list of plug-ins loaded on the portable electronic device to the server.” Janakiraman et al., however, discloses only the forwarding of “an HTML file specifying one or more multimedia files to client 120 so that web browser 122 of client 120 may output textual equivalents of the

Atty. Dkt. No. 025782-0114 (3669.Palm)  
(f/k/a 035451-0140)

multimedia content in the one or more multimedia files.” Janakiraman et al. makes no mention at all of “means for generating a list of file types supported by applications included in the electronic device.” In Janakiraman et al., the received multimedia files are simply searched within the client for possible textual equivalents contained within certain file types regardless of any generated list of supported file types. Thus, Janakiraman et al. fails to teach, disclose, or suggest “means for generating a list of file types supported by applications included in the electronic device” as included in the combination of steps of claim 81.

As to Timothy, the Office Action states that it “discloses the proxy server [see page 535 Section 2.4 ‘Automatic re-authoring’ and Section 2.5 ‘Page filtering’].” Timothy, however, only generally discloses performing web page filtering on a proxy server, and makes no specific mention of “means for generating a list of file types supported by applications included in the electronic device.” Thus, the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Timothy does not teach, disclose, or suggest “means for generating a list of file types supported by applications included in the electronic device,” and particularly not as part of a “system for transferring electronic information from a remote location to a portable electronic device” as recited in the combination of elements of claim 81. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claim 81 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn. Additionally, claim 82 depends from claim 81 and is thus patentable over the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Timothy for at least the same reasons as claim 81, and Applicants further request that the rejection of claim 82 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn as well.

**g. Rejection of claims 63 and 83-84 based on Janakiraman et al. in view of Timothy and further in view of Adachi.**

In section 40 of the Office Action, claims 63 and 83-84 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Janakiraman et al. in view of Timothy and further in view of Adachi. Each specific rejection is addressed below.

Atty. Dkt. No. 025782-0114 (3669,Palm)  
(f/k/a 035451-0140)

**i. Claim 63**

Claim 63 depends from claim 61. As explained above, the combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Timothy does not teach, disclose, or suggest the subject matter of claim 61. As to Adachi, it fails to disclose any of the elements of claim 61 mentioned above that are lacking in the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Timothy. Because the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Timothy and further in view of Adachi fails to disclose all of the elements of claim 61 as combined therein, and because claim 63 depends from claim 61, claim 63 is patentable over the cited combination of references for at least the same reasons as claim 61. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claim 63 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

**ii. Claims 83-84**

Claims 83-84 depend from claim 81. As explained above, the combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Timothy does not teach, disclose, or suggest the subject matter of claim 81. As to Adachi, it fails to disclose any of the elements of claim 81 mentioned above that are lacking in the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Timothy. Because the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Timothy and further in view of Adachi fails to disclose all of the elements of claim 81 as combined therein, and because claims 83-84 depend from claim 81, claims 83-84 are patentable over the cited combination of references for at least the same reasons as claim 81. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claims 83-84 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

**h. Rejection of claims 66 and 85 based on Janakiraman et al. in view of Timothy and further in view of Schwartz et al.**

In section 42 of the Office Action, claims 66 and 85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Janakiraman et al. in view of Timothy and further in view of Schwartz et al. Each specific rejection is addressed below.

Atty. Dkt. No. 025782-0114 (3669.Palm)  
(f/k/a 035451-0140)

**i. Claim 66**

Claim 66 depends from claim 61. As explained above, the combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Timothy does not teach, disclose, or suggest the subject matter of claim 61. As to Schwartz et al., it fails to disclose any of the elements of claim 61 mentioned above that are lacking in the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Timothy. Because the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Timothy and further in view of Schwartz et al. fails to disclose all of the elements of claim 61 as combined therein, and because claim 66 depends from claim 61, claim 66 is patentable over the cited combination of references for at least the same reasons as claim 61. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claim 66 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

**ii. Claim 85**

Claim 85 depends from claim 81. As explained above, the combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Timothy does not teach, disclose, or suggest the subject matter of claim 81. As to Schwartz et al., it fails to disclose any of the elements of claim 81 mentioned above that are lacking in the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Timothy. Because the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Timothy and further in view of Schwartz et al. fails to disclose all of the elements of claim 81 as combined therein, and because claim 85 depends from claim 81, claim 85 is patentable over the cited combination of references for at least the same reasons as claim 81. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claim 85 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

**Conclusion**

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

Atty. Dkt. No. 025782-0114 (3669.Palm)  
(f/k/a 035451-0140)

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 06-1447. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 06-1447. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 06-1447.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 8/4/2005

By Chad E. Bement

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 26371  
Telephone: (414) 297-5554  
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

Chad E. Bement  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 54,991